



## CLARK COUNTY

### RFP #777

#### ENGINEERING SERVICES for BRIDGE REHABILITATION

#### QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

UPDATED: MAY 14, 2020

	QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	Bridge #201, Brush Prairie is included in Attachment C as having deficient Rating Factors. However, this bridge is not listed in the scope of work (Part 1, Section 1A, #2). Please confirm whether the strengthening of Bridge 201 is included as part of the RFP.	This bridge is not included as part of the RFP.
2.	Bridge # 217 Venersborg Bridge, is listed in the scope of work (Part 1, Section 1A, #2) as requiring strengthening. However, this bridge's rating factors are not included Attachment C. Can you please confirm whether the strengthening of Bridge 217 is included as part of the RFP? a. If "yes", will you please provide its Rating Factors?	The rating factors are listed for this bridge in Attachment C.  The location for this bridge is not correct in Attachment C. The location is: NE 209 <sup>th</sup> St., crossing Salmon Creek  See bridge locations at: <a href="https://www.clark.wa.gov/public-works/restricted-bridges">https://www.clark.wa.gov/public-works/restricted-bridges</a>
3.	Bridge #222 (No name), is noted in Attachment C of the RFP as being located on NE Risto Rd, crossing Salmon Creek. This bridge does not appear along NE Risto Road according to our 2015 Clark County Road Atlas. Can you please provide the nearest side street to the bridge and / or provide some additional information for locating this bridge?	The location for this bridge is not correct in Attachment C. The location is: NE 167th Ave., over Mudd Creek  See bridge locations at: <a href="https://www.clark.wa.gov/public-works/restricted-bridges">https://www.clark.wa.gov/public-works/restricted-bridges</a>
4.	Will the County consider providing the design drawings for the scoped bridges to Proposers?	The existing design drawings are not available as part of this RFP.

5.	<p>Section IIC, #3 Management Approach requests the Proposer to provide resumes for all key team members and to also include a list of all other team members that will work on the projects. Part II, Section IIB, #2 indicates resumes are excluded from the page count. Is it the County's intent to also exclude the "list of all other team members that will work on the projects" from the overall page count?</p>	<p>The list of all other team members is considered part of the body of the proposal and counts toward the page count. Only the individual team member resumes will not count toward the page count.</p>
6.	<p>In light of the governor's Stay Home, Stay Healthy guidance, will Clark County accept proposal submittals via email?</p>	<p>Please follow the instructions in the RFP.</p>